REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested. 37 CFR 1.83(a) requires that the drawings show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. In this case, the feature in question is "a circular or oval cross section." The drawings show a circular cross section, and therefore show a cross section that is circular or oval. The drawings therefore show the claimed feature. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Reconsideration of the Section 112 rejection is respectfully requested. The claims have been amended to address all of the issues raised by the Examiner.

Reconsideration of the prior art rejections is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 has been amended to include limitations from original claims 2 and 5 plus additional limitations. Claim 1 is directed to the embodiment shown in Fig. 4 and specifies that the fastening element (20) is a plate-like projection defining a plane, and the predetermined breaking point (32) includes a hole having a longitudinal axis in the plane of the fastening element (20). This construction is not suggested by Matsuda or any of the other cited references.

With the predetermined breaking point being one hole whose longitudinal axis lies in the plane of the fastening element, the coordination of the material position and hole with respect to one another enables the predetermined breaking point to be precisely adapted to the required breaking force.

Therefore, claim 1 and dependent claims 2, 3, 7-10 and 14-16 are allowable.

New claim 17 is similar to amended claim 1 except that it includes limitations from original claims 2 and 6 plus additional limitations. Claim 1 is directed to the embodiment shown in Fig. 3 and specifies that the fastening element (20) is a plate-like projection defining a plane, and the predetermined breaking point (32) includes a plurality of holes each having a longitudinal axis perpendicular to the plane of the fastening element (20). This construction is not suggested by Matsuda or any of the other cited references. Matsuda teaches a single elongated hole, which has disadvantages in terms of production, and the breaking force cannot be set with sufficient accuracy.

Matsuda provides no suggestion of using a plurality of holes. With a plurality of holes, the predetermined breaking point can be set in a precise manner, since the notch effect of each individual hole can be combined with the notch effect of the other holes in order to thereby adapt

the predetermined breaking point precisely to the required breaking force.

Therefore, claim 17 and dependent claims 18-26 are allowable.

Dependent claims 19 and 23 further specify that the holes each have a circular cross section. This is not suggested by Matsuda.

In view of the foregoing, entry of the above amendment and allowance of claims 1-3, 7-10 and 14-26 are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/david r. price/

David R. Price
Reg. No. 31,557

Docket No.: 022862-1093
Michael Best & Friedrich LLP
100 East Wisconsin Avenue
Suite 3300
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202-4108
414.271.6560